

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 47-49 and 52-54 are currently pending

Cited Documents

[0003] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Knee: Knee, U.S. Patent No. 5,589,892
- Ullman: Ullman et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0084444

Claims 47-49 and 51-54 Are Non-Obvious Over Knee in view of Ullman

[0004] Claims 47-49 and 51-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Knee in view of Ullman. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 47

[0005] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 47 is obvious in view of the combination of Knee and Ullman. Applicant submits that the combination of Knee and Ullman does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim (with emphasis added):

47. (Previously Presented) A user interface unit comprising:

a processor;
an electronic programming guide (EPG) executing on the processor to:

organize programming information, including correlating Internet universal resource locators (URLs) with particular programs in the EPG, the URLs identifying target resources that contain supplemental information related to the particular programs; and

enable a user of the user interface to enter additional URLs identifying target resources that contain supplemental information related to the particular program, wherein the user associates the user entered additional URLs identifying target resources with a particular program or channel in the EPG, wherein the associated additional URLs are prioritized and displayed within an EPG Field associated with the particular program within the EPG, wherein prioritizing the associated additional URLs comprises monitoring the user's usage pattern of the associated additional URLs; and

the processor being programmed to search the EPG and identify the particular programs having correlated URLs as interactive programs.

[0006] Claim 47 recites in part, “a user of the user interface to enter additional URLs identifying target resources that contain supplemental information related to the particular program, wherein the user associates the user entered additional URLs identifying target resources with a particular program or channel in the EPG” and “the associated additional URLs are prioritized and displayed within an EPG Field associated with the particular program within the EPG, wherein prioritizing the associated additional URLs comprises monitoring the user's usage pattern of the associated additional URLs.” The Office cites Ullman, Fig. 7 and paragraphs [0016],

[0041], [0048], [0059] and [0062] as teaching these elements and features. (Office Action, pages 3 and 4.) Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as the relied upon portion of Ullman does not qualify as a prior art reference.

[0007] The present application currently claims priority to U.S. Patent Application no. 08/623,611 (issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837) filed on March 29, 1996. The applicable date for the relied upon subject matter in Ullman is July 6, 1998. Ullman did not contain subject matter relied upon by the Examiner until continuation-in-part application no. 09/109,945 (issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,018,768) was filed July 6, 1998. As this date is after the priority date of the present application, Ullman does not qualify as a prior art reference.

[0008] Consequently, the combination of Knee and Ullman does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 48

[0009] Claim 48 ultimately depends from independent claim 47. As discussed above, claim 47 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 48 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Independent Claim 49

[0010] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 49 is obvious in view of the combination of Knee and Ullman.

Applicant submits that the combination of Knee and Ullman does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim (with emphasis added):

49. (Previously Presented) A tangible computer-readable medium encoded with computer-executable instructions configured for:

designating data fields in an electronic programming guide (EPG) to hold programming information;

dedicating one of the data fields as a supplemental content field;

entering a plurality target specifications into the supplemental content field to correlate supplemental content with a program, the target specification identifying a location for the supplemental content, wherein the entering a target specification into the supplemental content field comprises receiving the target specification from a viewer accessing an EPG user interface (UI) supported by the EPG, wherein the plurality of target specifications is prioritized and displayed within a supplemental content field associated with the program within the EPG, wherein prioritizing the plurality of target specifications comprises monitoring the viewer's usage pattern of the target specification;

associating, by the viewer, the target specification identifying a location for the supplemental content with a particular program or channel in the EPG;

compiling a list of interactive programs, wherein each interactive program in the list is a program having an associated target specification; and

presenting the list of interactive programs through the EPG user interface (UI) supported by the EPG.

[0011] Claim 49 recites in part, "wherein the entering a target specification into the supplemental content field comprises receiving the target specification from a viewer

accessing an EPG user interface (UI) supported by the EPG” and “the plurality of target specifications is prioritized and displayed within a supplemental content field associated with the program within the EPG, wherein prioritizing the plurality of target specifications comprises monitoring the viewer’s usage pattern of the target specification.” The Office cites Ullman, Fig. 7 and paragraphs [0016], [0041], [0048], [0059] and [0062] as teaching these elements and features. (Office Action, pages 3 and 4.) Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as the relied upon portion of Ullman does not qualify as a prior art reference.

[0012] The present application currently claims priority to U.S. Patent Application no. 08/623,611 (issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837) filed on March 29, 1996. The applicable date for the relied upon subject matter in Ullman is July 6, 1998. Ullman did not contain subject matter relied upon by the Examiner until continuation-in-part application no. 09/109,945 (issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,018,768) was filed July 6, 1998. As this date is after the priority date of the present application, Ullman does not qualify as a prior art reference.

[0013] Consequently, the combination of Knee and Ullman does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 52 and 53

[0014] Claims 52 and 53 ultimately depend from independent claim 49. As discussed above, claim 49 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 52 and 53 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an

allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 54

[0015] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 54 is obvious in view of the combination of Knee and Ullman. Applicant submits that the combination of Knee and Ullman does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim (with emphasis added):

54. (Previously Presented) In a system having an electronic programming guide (EPG), a method comprising:

correlating user entered hyperlinks with corresponding programming information in the EPG, wherein the user enters the hyperlinks through an EPG user interface (UI) supported by the EPG and associates the hyperlink with a particular program or channel in the EPG, **wherein the entered hyperlinks are displayed within an EPG Field associated with the particular program or channel within the EPG, wherein prioritizing the entered hyperlinks comprises monitoring the user's usage pattern of the hyperlinks;** and

searching the EPG to identify interactive programs within the programming information that have correlated hyperlinks.

[0016] Claim 54 recites in part, "the entered hyperlinks are displayed within an EPG Field associated with the particular program or channel within the EPG, wherein prioritizing the entered hyperlinks comprises monitoring the user's usage pattern of the hyperlinks." The Office cites Ullman, Fig. 7 and paragraphs [0016], [0041], [0048], [0059] and [0062] as teaching these elements and features. (Office Action, pages 3 and

4.) Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as the relied upon portion of Ullman does not qualify as a prior art reference.

[0017] The present application currently claims priority to U.S. Patent Application no. 08/623,611 (issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837) filed on March 29, 1996. The applicable date for the relied upon subject matter in Ullman is July 6, 1998. Ullman did not contain subject matter relied upon by the Examiner until continuation-in-part application no. 09/109,945 (issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,018,768) was filed July 6, 1998. As this date is after the priority date of the present application, Ullman does not qualify as a prior art reference.

[0018] Consequently, the combination of Knee and Ullman does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Conclusion

[0019] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. NO. 59,090/ Dated: 2009-07-02
Jason F. Lindh (jason@leehayes.com; 509-944-4715)
Registration No. 59090